DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 016 SO 029 621

AUTHOR White, Charles S.
TITLE Civic Participation in the Internet Age.
PUB DATE 1998-10-00
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Engagement in Political and Civic Life: Citizenship in Twenty-First Century Democracies (Valley Forge, PA, October 4-9, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; Citizenship Education; *Civics; *Democracy; *Internet; *Political Issues; Political Science; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS Citizens Groups; *Newsgroups; Technology Integration

ABSTRACT

Added to the mix in current discussion about the future of American democracy is the potentially revolutionary impact of new information technologies on civic life. This paper explores the claims for technology's ability to enhance civic participation, focusing particular attention on the Internet. The paper states that the claims are grounded, however, within the larger context of political theory--specifically, the tension between representative and direct forms of democracy. It addresses this context first, before considering politics on the Internet and discussing a 1998 K. A. Hill and J. E. Hughes study about Usenet political newsgroups. Contains 24 references and 3 appendixes: Appendix A contains data on Usenet Newsgroups; Appendix B contains Websites used in the 1998 study; and Appendix C lists addresses for "electronic democracy" websites. (BT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 016

Civic Participation in the Internet Age

Charles S. White
Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Teaching
School of Education
Boston University

605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
Tel: 617-353-8482
Fax: 617-353-3924
E-mail: cswhite@bu.edu

SO 029 621

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles S. White

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A paper presented at the
International Conference on Engagement in Political and Civic Life:
Citizenship in Twenty-First Century Democracies
Freedoms Foundation
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania
October 4-9, 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Civic Participation in the Internet Age[1]

Date: 13 May 1995 18:28:55 GMT
From: Anonymous@meeting.fedworld.gov (Rand Knox)
To: partdemo@meeting.fedworld.gov
Subject: DEMOCRACY DIRECT
Message-ID: <3p2tp7$2dk@meeting.fedworld.gov>

So-called "representative" government was a very good design before the days of the telegraph, telephone, car and the computer. However, representative government has become filtered through the elitism of special interested and moneyed special interests at the peril of the public interest.

To address this shortcoming and to evolve government and democracy, it [is] time to abolish the lower House of Representatives and replace it with direct democracy where we the people legislate from our living rooms by phone and personal identification voting numbers. The internet, C-span, and other media has [sic] evolved to allow us to educate ourselves sufficiently to act collectively as a direct check on the Upper House, the Presidency and the Courts, which likewise would remain in place to check the tyranny of the masses.

Introduction

The e-mail message above was one of dozens that appeared as part of an experimental national electronic open meeting on "People And Their Governments In The Information Age," held during the first two weeks of May 1995, and sponsored in part by the Office of Management and Budget.[2] According to the invitation to join the discussion, the national electronic open meeting was "part of an ongoing effort to broaden public participation in creating an electronic government." One of the subtopics of the meeting, supported by its own listserver, was participatory democracy, which focused on "ensuring everyone's chance to be heard in a democracy."[3] And many people's voices were indeed heard, often expressing sentiments similar to those of Rand Knox above.

---

[1]Portions of this paper appeared in my 1997 article titled "Citizen Participation and the Internet: Prospects for Civic Deliberation in the Information Age" in The Social Studies.

2Other sponsors included the Administration's Information Infrastructure Task Force (IITF), the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), the National Technical Information Service's (NTIS) FedWorld, and the National Performance Review (NPR).

3Other listservs supported the following topics: Services (from emergency help and health care to business licenses); Benefits (from Social Security and food stamps to small business grants); Information (from declassified secrets and

Apparent in Knox's message and many others exchanged in the electronic meeting is a deep disenchantment with the apparent lack of responsiveness to citizens' interests by elected representatives and with the negative impact of special interests. It also reflects an equally deep faith in the collective wisdom of citizens, in the benefits of greater civic participation, and in the power of technology to expand civic participation. Rejection of representative democracy in favor of more direct democracy is not new, and reflects a persistent tension in American political life with roots reaching back well beyond the Constitutional Convention. Added to the mix in current discussion about the future of American democracy is potentially revolutionary impact of new information technologies on civic life. Electronic tools of the Information Age are transforming many of our nation's institutions. As the message above argues, government and politics are not likely to be immune from technology's touch.

This paper explores the claims for technology's ability to enhance civic participation, focusing particular attention on the Internet. The claims, however, are grounded within the larger context of political theory; specifically, the tension between representative and direct forms of democracy. This must be addressed first.

What's Wrong with Government and Politics Today?

Demands for greater civic participation in government decision making seem to rise and fall on waves of dissatisfaction with existing social conditions and, most especially, with a lack of trust in elected representatives. Populists of the late 19th century saw greater civic participation through direct democracy as a way to wrest power from the railroads, trusts, and monopolies that held sway over state and national legislatures. The Progressive Era in the early 20th century and the grassroots politics of today have been animated similarly by a desire to bring political discussion out of "smoke-filled rooms" and to remove political power from representatives who are perceived to have sacrificed the public interest to special interests.

Even the casual newspaper reader can find evidence of a growing disquiet among everyday citizens and political commentators about the quality of civic life in America. More and more

---

economic statistics to satellite maps); and Technology (how the technical portion of electronic government will work).

people believe that they are individually and collectively losing control of the forces that govern their lives, and that the moral fabric of their communities is unraveling (Sandel 1996). Citizens are becoming more cynical about politics generally and, as a result, are abandoning the electoral process at both the national and local levels (DiBiaggio 1997; Nealon 1995). They perceive that the decisions of their representatives are up for bid to special interest groups; that those representatives and special interests spend a considerable amount of time and money manipulating public opinion rather than listening to it. As a result, there seems to be little incentive to become the informed and participative citizens we ought to be.

The Citizens We Ought To Be

Underlying popular discontent about civic life are a collection of assumptions about how government ought to be and, by implication, how citizens ought to be. These assumptions derive from a classical theory of democracy, characterized by Walker (1966) as:

> the familiar doctrine of popular rule, patterned after the New England town meeting, which asserts that public policy should results from extensive, informed discussion and debate. By extending general participation in decision making the classical theorists hoped to increase the citizen's awareness of his moral and social responsibilities, reduce the danger of tyranny, and improve the quality of government. (p. 285)

Active engagement and participation of citizens is the keystone of classical theory, because in citizens alone resides the general will, the essence of sovereignty. And the general will, according to Rousseau, cannot be represented. "Any law which the people has not ratified in person is void; it is not law at all" (Rousseau, The Social Contract, Book III, Ch. 15, p. 141).

Classical theories of democracy place a high premium on self-rule by an engaged citizenry, dispersed power, and the common good pursued through collective deliberation. As Michael J. Sandel (1996) points out, political systems so constituted require a significant level of solidarity and character (or virtue) on the part of citizens. Participation has an educative effect on citizens, alerting them to their civic duties and helping them to recognize the common good. Responsible citizenship is multi-faceted and active and informed.

The Citizens We Are

For most citizens, citizenship is not multifaceted and active. Quite the contrary. Public opinion survey research after World War II (e.g., Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee 1954; Campbell, Guring, and Miller 1954; Lasswell 1948) revealed that few citizens were active participants in the political process; low voter turnout was one indicator of this. Moreover, the informed citizen was the exception rather than the rule.

Neither interest nor knowledge has changed much in the last forty years. According to a recent survey of randomly-selected adults by the Washington Post, the Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University, millions of Americans cannot answer even basic questions about American politics (Washington Post 1996). Three of four respondents were not aware that senators are elected for six years. Four in ten did not know that Republicans control both chambers of Congress. Moreover, the less informed are less likely to participate in politics. Both becoming informed and participating take time, a commodity most people believe is in short supply these days.

Elitist Theory of Democracy and the Argument for Representative Democracy

Our system of government works despite ill-informed and inactive citizens. Political theorists responded to this contradiction of classical theory by dividing the political system into two groups: the elite and the remaining mass of citizens. The success of democracy rests on the elites being informed and participative; the citizen's role is limited to choosing among competing elites within a broad political consensus. It is the chosen elite, the representatives of the people, who engage in the kind of deliberation that, according to classical theory, would normally reside in the people themselves.

Citizens who are ill-informed are not without opinions, of course. Public opinion polling has risen to a high art and a mainstay of American politics. In the presidential 1996 election, television networks convened groups of "average citizens" to electronically record their reactions to political speeches as the speeches were delivered — what one might call "real-time" opinion polling. Indeed, the science of public opinion surveying has improved so significantly over the last

four decades, that we are able to gauge fairly accurately the current state of ill-informed public opinion on a wide range of issues.

The Founders recognized, however, that opinion is not the same as judgment, and opted to eschew direct democracy in favor of a representative system that places greater weight on *deliberation* by elected representatives than on the *political equality* that direct democracy would achieve (Fishkin 1992). In Federalist 10, Madison drew the fundamental distinction between a republic and a (direct) democracy:

> The effect [of a republic] is . . . to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation, it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose. (Hamilton, Jay, and Madison, p. 59)

Such an arrangement would have the dual benefit of increasing deliberation on matters of the public interest and minimizing the likelihood of a tyranny of the majority. Hamilton stated the matter more pointedly in Federalist 71:

> The republican principle demands that the deliberate sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they intrust the management of their affairs; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men, who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. It is a just observation, that the people commonly intend the public good. This often applies to their very errors. But their good sense would despise the adulator who should pretend that they always reason right about the means of promoting it. . . . When occasions present themselves, in which the interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed to be the

guardians of those interests, to withstand the temporary delusion, in order to give them a time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection. (Hamilton et. al., pp. 464-465)

Increasing Civic Participation: The Pros and Cons

How should we respond, then, to calls for greater involvement (indeed, direct involvement) of citizens in deciding matters of national public policy? On the positive side, we recognize that the scope of civic participation has expanded over the last two hundred years, both in terms of suffrage and (at the state and local level) the use of referenda, initiatives, and recall. Greater direct participation in decision making might well ameliorate the current level of cynicism about government and increase citizens' acceptance of their civic responsibilities. Direct decision making on important public issues would likely encourage citizens to become more interested and better informed, and to appear more regularly in voting booths.

On the other hand, most citizens are not prepared to participate in anything approaching direct democracy. Citizens lack information and, as such, provide nothing more than uninformed opinion. Citizens lack the time and the resources to become sufficiently informed on the multitude of complex issues they would confront. Citizens are susceptible to manipulation by those who would stir up their passions and prejudices, or who would expend substantial sums of money to manipulate public opinion to serve their own, narrow special interest. In national plebiscites, there is little provision for the kind of cool-headed, face-to-face deliberation Madison and Hamilton believed was essential to the prevention of tyranny.

Information Technology and Civic Participation

Proponents of "teledemocracy" believe that new information technologies will make direct democracy possible while avoiding the problems ascribed to it by its critics. Claims Benjamin Barber (1984), "interactive systems have a great potential for equalizing access to information, stimulating participatory debate across regions, and encouraging multichoice polling and voting informed by information, discussion, and debate. It suggests ways to overcome the problem of scale and to defeat technological complexity by putting technology to work for popular democratic ends" (p. 276).

According to proponents, technology will make it possible for the mass of citizens at large to register their opinions on matters of national public policy and will provide citizens with a virtually limitless volume of information on which to base their decisions. The greatest obstacle to overcome, they say, is the widespread dissemination of technology throughout the society. In the words of Frederick T. Sleeper, a Republican pollster: "The problem with direct democracy was logistical, not philosophical. But with the information technology we have now, there's no reason why the whole people cannot 'meet' electronically and decide public issues" (quoted in Broder 1994).

The information technology Sleeper references is the Internet, a network of networks constructed by the U.S. military in the early 1970s. In thirty years, the Internet has expanded dramatically, both in terms of the nodes in the system and the number and types of users. For some time, electronic mail remained the easiest application to fathom; access to information collections was cumbersome because you had to know exactly where to look. The development of "gopher" software in the early 1990s made searching for information sources more accessible to non-technical users of the Internet. With the development of the World Wide Web, navigating the information resources of the Internet has been made substantially easier than in the past, allowing users to track down information through hotlinks, specialized screen text that, when clicked on, sends the user to another location/node on the Internet that contains information related to that which s/he seeks.

Locating information is only half the story. The other half is the freewheeling exchange of opinions that the Internet supports. The Boston Globe proclaimed that "for the first time, the Internet has joined public debate as a distinctive yet equal partner with the more traditional media. . . .The most appealing quality about the Internet is its inherent democracy" (1995). Recent research on how citizens use the Internet to discuss politics provides support for the newspaper's claim.

Politics on the Internet: Research Findings

A couple of years ago, three well-meaning political scientists endeavored to electronically survey Internet users about their use of the system for political purposes, in an effort to describe some models of electronic democracy and to describe how folks use the Internet to participate in

civic life (Fisher, Margolis, and Resnick 1994). Among their findings was a strong aversion to the survey, as evidenced by a significant number of "flames" (ad hominem attacks) received. They also discovered some of the difficulties associated the sampling and reliability. In the case of the former, the researchers discovered that numerous respondents had taken the liberty of forwarding the electronic survey to multiple other recipients. Given the ease of electronic editing and an ASCII-based survey instrument, a number of respondents decided to alter the survey, adjust questions to their liking, add response categories, and the like, wreaking havoc with reliability. The line between democracy and anarchy blurred in cyberspace.

Somewhat more successful was the research conducted by Kevin Hill and John Hughes (1998), political scientists at Florida International University and Monmouth University, respectively. Using data from two surveys conducted by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (1995, 1996), as well as they own data, Hill and Hughes sketch the general contours of political use of the Internet by citizens.

Internet activists. Typical Internet users are more highly educated, have higher incomes, and are younger than the population at large. Of these, between 10 and 25 percent engage in some political activity. These individuals Hill and Hughes label "Internet activists." The activists tend to be more liberal and more politically active; they enjoy politics, are better informed than their peers, and seek detailed information. Oddly, however, the content of Internet political discussion is predominantly conservative, based on analysis of messages contained in a particular environment called the Usenet.

Usenet newsgroups and political discourse. Usenet is a vast electronic bulletin board system accessible on the Internet, supporting several million messages per year. Messages are organized by topic through newsgroups; someone posts a message to the newsgroup and others respond, creating a discussion "thread" that can be followed, saved, and analyzed.

Of 95 newsgroups they identified as addressing political content, Hill and Hughes randomly selected 22 to analyze closely (see Appendix A for a list of newsgroups included in their study). Within each of these newsgroups, they randomly selected threads to follow over the course

of one week. They repeated this procedure for 10 weeks, analyzing 1,012 threads comprising 5,611 individual messages from May to June, 1995..

The researchers discovered that the preponderance of messages were ideologically neutral, especially with respect to government policies. But those newsgroup threads that were ideological or government-oriented were decidedly conservative and anti-government. Hill and Hughes suggest that while conservative and right-wing activists are in the minority within Usenet newsgroups, they are much more active. The researchers opine that conservative groups "are motivated by the sense that they are not represented by the media . . . .The Usenet itself does not create anti-government or conservative attitudes. Rather, those sharing these beliefs are drawn to the medium and make better use of it" than liberal and left-wing activists (Hill & Hughes 1998, p. 73). More important than political orientation, however, is the shape and manner of political discourse supported by the Internet. Again, Hill and Hughes see both good news and bad news for civic participation.

Of particular interest to the researchers was evidence of debates; that is, a series of messages and responses within the newsgroup in which opposing viewpoints were aired. Debate threads, however, were in the minority; many threads never generating a response (Hill & Hughes 1998, p. 71). While most threads did provide verifiable information, there wasn't much information to verify, especially in debates. Flaming, however, was present. "Flames represent only 40% of [debate] threads. So the majority of discourse on the Usenet is relatively civil" (pp. 71-72). Unfortunately, flaming was more prevalent in debates than in other threads and was clearly more frequent than one would expect in face-to-face conversation (p. 71). Debates were also less likely to involve the presentation of information (p. 63), since most debates "are about normative issues, not objective ones, and normative statements require little in the way of evidence" (pp. 128-129).

Community building and group cohesiveness are central activities in politically-oriented Usenet newsgroups. According to Hill and Hughes (1998), Usenet meets the three basic criteria describing a group:

> [Newsgroups] engage in leadership activities designed to establish a group norm, they police those who violate that norm, and they recruit others to their cause and they do so strategically — they seek out those most likely to agree with them. Thus, the Usenet is not only a means of communicating, it is a place where people can connect with others, share their views, and, at least potentially, develop their political beliefs . . . .The Usenet is not something that will fundamentally change people and their attitudes. Rather, it is something people use to reinforce beliefs they have already developed. (p. 72).

Some of those beliefs span a broad range of ideologies, including what some refer to as "the fringe." Consider the following excerpt of a posting to a newsgroup in the wake of the government siege of the Koresh compound at Waco, Texas, and the alleged involvement of civilian "militias" in the bombing of the municipal building in Oklahoma City:

> The Butcher of Waco [Attorney General Janet Reno] . . . has stated her intentions of [sic] 'Get' the Michigan Civilian Militia. Towards that end we have learned of the following preparatory arrangements that will likely result in the loss of life of militia members, their families and of law enforcement officers . . . ."

Clearly, the Usenet shows some of the tendencies the critics of electronic democracy fear. It tends to "draw people into isolated groups, conversing among themselves" (Hill & Hughes 1998, p. 74). At a less sinister level, much of what passes for political discussion can best be compared to two teenage siblings in the heat of argument: "Did not! Did so! Did not!! Did so!!" and so forth.

Despite its drawbacks and limitations, Hill and Hughes consider Usenet newgroups as holding considerable potential for positive civc engagement. Unlike chat rooms (America Online's "The Cloak Room" is one example), where the pace of real-time conversation demands rapid-fire comments, the Usenet is slower and more thoughtful — like deliberation should be (pp. 130-131).

World Wide Web. As with the Usenet, the World Wide Web is home to the full range of political expressions — the good, the bad, and the ugly. About 21 percent of the websites Hill and Hughes studied could be classified as "extremist" in content ; however, the other 79 percent is fairly well balanced along the mainstream political spectrum (see Appendix B for the list of

websites analyzed). Conservative websites tend to be technically flashier, larger, and more sophisticated, focusing on recruitment and advertising. The smaller liberal sites have numerous links to other sites and are more intent on community building. Extremist sites tend to be less technically sophisticated, but there are exceptions (1998, pp. 174-176).

There is a growing number of websites whose explicit purpose is to increase civic participation and access to information. Democracy Place USA [http://democracyplace.org] is an experiment in civic journalism (also called public journalism), a controversial effort to encourage the public media (newspapers, television, etc.) to listen to the needs and interests of citizens and use what they hear to help set the public agenda (Jurkowitz, 1996). Visitors to the site can access candidate information, news reports, and information on current issues, as well as engage in electronic discussions.

Another such website is the Jefferson Project [http://www.voxpop.org/jefferson]. Expressing one's opinion is only one of a substantial number of options. Many of the options that appear on the site's homepage send the visitor to other, related websites, listservers, and mailing lists that span the political spectrum. A quick search of "electronic democracy" with a standard Web search engine will generate a broad and growing list of sites dedicated to expanding civic information and participation (see the Appendix C for a sampling of electronic democracy websites).

The Internet and Electronic Democracy: A Public Space for Deliberation?.

The Usenet results reported by Hill and Hughes (1998) are representative of the mixed prospects for civic participation through technology:

> Utopians hope that computer-mediated discourse will make our nation more democratic, more deliberative, and more informed, while the dystopians fear it will make us more divisive, banal, and susceptible to demagogues. What we have learned about the Usenet gives some support to both groups. For the utopians, flames are relatively few and debates do make up the bulk of the content . . . But on the less optimistic side, we see that information is used more often to recruit like-minded individuals than to persuade others, and yet it is persuasion that is the key to deliberation. (1998, p. 63)

None of the current modes of electronic participation passes muster for thorough-going direct democracy of the kind wished for by the e-mailer at the outset of this paper. The Internet provides places to respond to an opinion poll. It provides places for faceless individuals to express (often, to shout) anonymous views. It provides places to examine useful reference material and background information. But the Internet does not yet provide adequate places for deliberation. As David Broder has observed, "The crucial ingredient that distinguishes a mass of people from a responsible public is the opportunity for deliberation . . . . It is the dialogue that makes for democracy" (1994). But deliberation is a public act, in which opinions must be advanced and defended in the full light of public scrutiny, not in the shadows of electronic anonymity. It is through such deliberation that an electorate becomes an informed citizenry.

What we need, says Sandel, are "public spaces that gather citizens together, enable them to interpret their condition, and cultivate solidarity and civic engagement" (1996). More than this, we need public spaces for genuine deliberation. Some of those public spaces might be electronic in nature, but technology has a long way to develop before it can begin to contribute to anything other than "democracy by poll" (Broder 1994).

Conclusion

Despite recent advances in information technology, we are well short of the potential for direct democracy that Barber and others envision. Experiments in teledemocracy are recent and have been limited in scope. For example, the QUBE system initiated in Columbus, Ohio a number of years ago, demonstrated that information technology (in this case, interactive cable television) could link citizens in their homes directly to the site of decisions and can facilitate direct civic participation in political decision making. Yet, experiments like QUBE have been of limited success. According to Arterton (1987), while the teledemocracy project he reviewed did seem to improve citizen access to decision making and broaden participation, the costs were substantial. So much so that those who were bearing the costs tended to want to have a substantial say in setting the agenda. Moreover, the technology didn't seem to reduce apathy. Based on his research, Arterton judged that two-thirds of citizens simply will not participate, regardless of the technology.

Beyond enhancing the level of participation, information technology has not yet demonstrated that it improve the quality of participation, by moving beyond simple opinion sharing. Commenting on "electronic town meeting" efforts, including the one advanced by Ross Perot in his presidential campaigns, Michael Schudson (1992) commented:

> For Perot, as for too many others, public opinion consists of individual preferences and values; the task is simply to find a technique good enough to ascertain them. For most democratic theorists, on the other hand, public opinion consists of opinions formed in public, as people collectively face public issues; it is not a set of inclinations, grunts, nods of approval and disapproval privately evolved and privately expressed to a pollster or voting machine. Democratic theory typically (and rightly) envisions a system of government organized as much to foster deliberation as to guarantee participation. (p. 44)

As a rich source for information or data, new information technologies already bring to citizen's fingertips the means to better understand political issues. But the application of technology to broaden meaningful civic participation at a national level has its limits, many of which were anticipated by the Founders more than two centuries ago.

References

Arterton, F.C. 1987. Teledemocracy: Can technology protect democracy? Newbury Park, CA: Sage Library of Social Research.

Barber, B. 1984. Strong democracy. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Berelson, B.R., P.F. Lazarsfeld, and W.N. McPhee. 1954. Voting. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Boston Globe. 1995. "A Net gain for free speech." July 10. p. 10.

Broder, D.S. 1994. Democracy by poll. The Washington Post. April 12. p. 11.

Campbell, A., G. Gurin, and W.E. Miller. 1954. The voter decides. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Cronin, T.E. 1989. Direct democracy: The politics of initiative, referendum, and recall. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

DiBiaggio, J. (1997). How do we set fire to America's sagging spirit? The Boston Globe. May 2. p. A23.

Fisher, B., M. Margolis, and D. Resnick. 1994. A new way of talking politics: democracy on the Internet. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in New York City.[http://www.eff.org/pub/Activism/E-voting/net_civics.survey]

Fishkin, J.S. 1992. Democracy and deliberation. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hamilton, A., J. Jay, and J. Madison. (E.M. Earle, Ed.). 1937. The Federalist. New York: The Modern Library.

Hill, K.A., and Hughes, J.E. 1998. Cyberpolitics: Citizen activism in the age of the Internet. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jurkowitz, M. (1996). Talking back. The Boston Globe Magazine. February 25. pp. 15,24,27-31.

Lasswell, H.D. 1948. The analysis of political behavior: An empirical approach. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, Ltd.

Linday, J.M. 1995. Electronic democracy. [http://www.jc.edu/~stevenso/republic.html]

Nealon, P. 1995. The vanishing voter. The Boston Globe. May 1. pp. 1,19.

Pateman, C. 1970. Participation and democratic theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 1995. Americans going online: Explosive growth, uncertain destinations. Washington, D.C.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 1996. News attracts most Internet users. Washington, D.C.

Rousseau, J-J. 1968. (M. Cranston, Ed). The Social Contract. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Sandel, M.J. 1996. America in search of a public philosophy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schudson, M. 1992. The limits of teledemocracy. The American Prospect. Fall. pp. 41-45.

Walker, J.L. 1966. A critique of the elitist theory of democracy. The American Political Science Review 60(2): 285-95.

Washington Post. (1996). Survey looks at political insight. Washington Post. February 11. p. 32.

Appendix A[4]

Distribution of Ideology and Attitudes toward Government in Sampled Usenet Newsgroups

Name	Ideology of Group	Group Position on Government
alt.activism.d	36% L / **46% N** / 18% R	4% P / **68% N** / 29% A
alt.conspiracy.jfk	3% / **76% N** / 22% R	0% P / **82% N** / 18% A
alt.fan.ronald-reagan	0% L / 47% N / **53% R**	0% P / **77% N** / 24% A
alt.gorby.gone.gone.gone	—	—
alt.law-enforcement	13% I / **67% N** / 21% R	4% P / **83% N** / 13% A
alt.org.audubon	14% L / **86% N** / 0% R	0% P / **100% N** / 0% A
alt.politics.clinton	17% L / 37% N / **46% R**	4% P / **71% N** / 25% A
alt.politics.elections	14% L / **46% N** / 41% R	0% P / **86% N** / 14% A
alt.politics.nationalism.white	4% L / 34% N / **62% R**	0% P / **80% N** / 20% A
alt.politics.org.misc	0% L / **95% N** / 5% R	0% P / **100% N** / 0% A
alt.politics.perot	0% L / **55% N** / 45% R	0% P / **68% N** / 32% A
alt.politics.usa.constitution	25% L / 31% N / **45% R**	0% P / **55% N** / 45% A
alt.politics.usa.republican	10% L / 37% N / **53% R**	1% P / **78% N** / 21% A
alt.revolution.counter	0% L / 7% N / **93% R**	0% P / **64% N** / 36% A
alt.rush-limbagh	—	—
alt.society.anarchy	**35% L** / 35% N / 31% R	0% P / **59% N** / 41% A
alt.society.conservatism	8% L / 28% N / **64% R**	0% P / **72% N** / 28% A
alt.society.revolution	**57% L** / 17% N / 26% R	9% P / **89% N** / 3% A
alt.war.vietnam	8% L / **86% N** / 6% R	0% P / **92% N** / 8% A
soc.rights.human	**46% L** / 38% N / 16% R	4% P / **82% N** / 15% A
talk.politics.guns	7% L / 19% N / **74% R**	0% P / **55% N** / 46% A
talk.politics.misc	21% L / **45% N** / 34% R	2% P / **77% N** / 21% A
Total	16% L / **46% N** / 39% R	2% P/ **76% N** / 23% A

Note: Some cells do not total 100% due to rounding. Bolded figures represent the modal ideology or position for group.

Legend: L= Left-wing; N= Non-Ideological, R= Right-wing; P = Pro-government, N = Neutral, A = Anti-government

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[4]Hill, K.A., and Hughes, J.E. 1998. Cyberpolitics: Citizen activism in the age of the Internet. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Table 3.2, p. 55.

Appendix B[5]

Websites Used in Hill and Hughes (1998) Study

Site Name	Site Address	Ideology
A WEPIN (Weapon) for Freedom and Sovereignty	colossus.net/wepinsto/wshome.html	Rightist
Adopt-a-Convict	www.webserve.com/phrantic/adoptcon.htm	Neutral
Alliance to Expose Government Corruption and Corporate Crime	www.well.com/user/pfrankl	Leftist
American Coalition for Fathers and Children	www.acfc.org/	Conservative
American Intelligence	www.amintel.com	Neutral
Americans for Hope, Growth, and Opportunity	www.ahgo.org	Conservative
Americans for Tax Reform	www.atr.org/	Conservative
Arizona Democratic Party	www.azdem.org	Liberal
AZConnect Community	getnet.com/azconnect	Neutral
Bob Dole as Obstructionist	www.ctyme.com/dole/obstruct.htm	Liberal
Californians for Justice	www.igc.apc.org/cfj	Liberal
Campaigning On-line	www.campol.com	Conservative
Capital Research	www.capitalresearch.org	Conservative
CapWeb: The Citizen's Guide to Congress	www.capweb.net	Neutral
Center for Civic Networking	civic.net/ccn.html	Neutral
Center for International Policy	www.us.net/cip	Liberal
Center for Public Integrity Homepage	www.essential.org/cpi	Neutral
Center for Voting and Democracy	www.igc.apc.org/cvd	Liberal
Cerebral Commentary Site	www.wavefront.com/~albert	Conservative
Christian Coalition	www.cc.org	Conservative
Citizens for Better Government	www.afn.org/~govern	Rightist
Citizens for Tax Justice	www.ctj.org	Conservative
Colorado Hemp Initiative Project Homepage	www.welcomehome.org/cohip.html	Libertarian
Common Cause	www.commoncause.org	Liberal
Common Dreams	www.commondreams.org	Liberal
Concord Coalition at UW	weber.u.washington.edu/~freeman/CONCORD/	Conservative
Conservative Generation X	www.cgx.com	Conservative
Conservative Zone, The	www.soltec.net/~cknite	Conservative
CRY Home Page	www.wnx.com/~cry	Liberal
Democratic Capitalism Against Rush Limbaugh Economics	web.cetlink.net/~kellycm/	Liberal
Democratic Leadership Council – Progressive Policy Institute	www.dlcppi.org	Liberal
Democratic Socialists of America Home Page	www.dsausa.org	Leftist
Doug's Political Essays	www.muscle.net/~doug/essays	Conservative
Empower America	www.empower.org	Conservative
Ethics and Public Policy Center	www.eppc.org	Conservative
Fair Housing Institute, Inc.	www.mindspring.com/~fairhous	Neutral
Federalist Society	www.fed-soc.org	Libertarian
Federation of American Scientists	www.fas.org	Liberal
Fight the Right Network Homepage	www.critpath.org/ftrn	Liberal
Flat Tax Home Page	flattax.house.gov/	Conservative
Fletcher Prouty Reference Site	home.xl.ca/fiasco/prouty/	Rightist
Florida Secession Home Page	hubcap.clemson.edu/~mwsmith/fishpan/florida	Rightist
Golden Key Campaign for Private Communications Online	www.eff.org/goldkey.html	Libertarian
HYSN Home Page	www.pbd.com/~hinet	Neutral
Industrial Workers of the World	www.iww.org	Leftist
Institute for Anarchist Studies	members.aol.com/iastudy/Default.htm	Leftist
Institute for Policy Innovation	www.ipi.org	Libertarian
John Birch Society	www.jbs.org	Rightist
Journal X	www.journalx.com	Neutral
League of Conservation Voters	www.lcv.org	Liberal

[5]Hill, K.A., and Hughes, J.E. 1998. Cyberpolitics: Citizen activism in the age of the Internet. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Table A.2, pp. 196-199.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Site Name	Site Address	Ideology
League of Revolutionaries for a New America	www.mcs.com/~jdav/league.html	Leftist
Learning Logic Foundation Think Tank	pw2.netcom.com/~think/tank.html	Neutral
Let America Speak!	www.rtk.net/las	Neutral
Liberals and Libertarians	www.batnet.com/liberty/liberal/	Libertarian
Libertarian Party	www.lp.org	Libertarian
Log Cabin Republicans of Austin	www.bga.com/~labinski/512top.htm	Conservative
Motorcycle Riders Foundation	www.mrf.org/	Libertarian
Myth of the Magical Bureaucracy	www.house.gov/hoekstra/myth/home.html	Conservative
National Center for Policy Analysis	www.public-policy.org/~ncpa	Conservative
Natural Resources Defense Council	www.igc.apc.org/nrdc	Liberal
New Democracy Home Page	members.aol.com/newdem/index.htm	Leftist
New Party	www.newparty.org	Leftist
NY Transfer	www.blythe.org	Leftist
Official Reform Party Home Page	www.reformparty.org	Conservative
Patrick Henry On-line	www.clandjop.com/~mlindste	Rightist
Pennsylvania Association for Government Relations	www.pagr.org	Neutral
Policy.Com Home Page	policy.com	Neutral
Political Chat!	www.4-lane.com/politicalchat/	Neutral
Political Distortions	www.ibenet.com/ndl/distortions/political.html	Neutral
Power to the People	ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/americanl	Rightist
Presidents of the United States	www.ipl.org/ref/POTUS/	Neutral
Prince William County Young Republicans	www.princewilliam.com/pwcyr	Conservative
Public Access Project	members.aol.com/paccess593/index.htm	Neutral
Puerto Rican Political Prisoners	members.aol.com/ballerne/theprisoners.htm	Leftist
Puerto Rico Statehood Website	www.puertorico51.org/english/index2.html	Neutral
RAND Corporation	www.rand.org	Conservative
Reason Foundation	www.reason.org	Libertarian
Repper Garcia Online -- Tampa Bay Politics	www.repper.com	Neutral
Republic of Texas	www.republic-of-texas.com/	Rightist
Rick Tompkins for President	www.nguworld.com/rick96	Libertarian
Rutherford Institute	www.rutherford.org	Conservative
Santa Barbara Democrats	www.sbdemocrats.org	Liberal
Save Our Skies	www.scican.net/~sos	Liberal
School of the Americas Watch	www.derechos.org/soaw/	Leftist
Secret History of the United States 1962-1996, The	w3.one.net/~conspira/Welcome.html	Leftist
Sempervirens Fund	reality.sgi.com/employees/ctb/sempervirens/	Liberal
Sheet Metal Workers International Association	www.smwia.org	Liberal
Socialist International	www.gn.apc.org/socint	Leftist
Student Space Awareness Virtual Headquarters	www.seds.org/ssa	Neutral
Third Parties '96	www.envirolink.org/greens/3rd-p96	Liberal
Third Parties '96	sunsite.unc.edu/spc/tp96	Liberal
Town Hall	www.townhall.com	Conservative
United States Freedom Fighters Home Page	usff.com	Rightist
Unofficial Rush Limbaugh	www.rtis.com/nat/pol/rush	Conservative
Unofficial Traci Topps for Prez Page	www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/9194/	Conservative
USS Liberty	www.halcyon.com/jim/ussliberty	Neutral
Vox Pop	www.voxpop.org	Neutral
War Criminal Watch	www.igc.apc.org/wcw	Liberal
Whitewater Estates Home Page	biz.arkansas.net/whitewaterestates/	Conservative
Woodstock Institute	online.nonprofit.net/woodstock/	Liberal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C
Electronic Democracy Websites

http://www.cpn.org/index.html	Civic Practices Network
http://www.closeup.org/home.htm	Close Up Foundation Home Page
http://www.allpolitics.com/	CNN/Time AllPolitics
http://www.c-span.org/	Welcome to the C-SPAN Network
http://democracyplace.org/~democracy/forum.html	Democracy Forum
http://democracyplace.org/	Democracy Place: USA
http://epn.org/	Electronic Policy Network
http://www.col-ed.org/pro/temc.html	The Electronic Model Congress
http://www.voxpop.org:80/jefferson/	The Jefferson Project
http://www.hotwired.com/netizen/	The Netizen
http://www.pbs.org/democracy/	The PBS Democracy Project
http://www.politicsnow.com/	PoliticsNow
http://www.publius.com/	Publius
http://www.vote-smart.org/	Vote Smart Web
http://www.rtis.com/nat/pol	RealCom: National Politics and Personalities

Charles S. White is an associate professor in the School of Education at Boston University in Boston, Massachusetts. While his specialty is social studies education, Dr. White spent nine years as coordinator of the instructional technology graduate program and director of the Center for Interactive Educational Technology at George Mason University in Virginia. He is author of two books and numerous articles on the subject of educational technology, especially in history and social science education. Most recently, he has provided civic education training and curriculum development guidance to Russian educators as part of *Civitas: An International Civic Education Exchange* program.